

the impression upon him that we are to furnish him with all of the materials of war?

I find that some Senators are not willing to express an opinion one way or the other. Wait, and then we will determine whether we will interpose. That is the language of the Senator from Illinois, (Mr. DOUGLASS); and is the language of the Senator from Michigan, (Mr. CORY); and is the language of the Senator from Mississippi, who read the speech of the distinguished Secretary of State of 1823, it drew my attention at once to the situation of this country at that time, and the principles by which the republican party had stood from the days of Washington down to the present hour. Then it was that Greece was trodden down; then it was that revolutions were going on in Europe; then it was that our Government had to announce to the civilized world the principles upon which we administered this Republic; then it was—I would remind the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. FOOTE)—that the distinguished Mr. Monroe (that man who concentrated in himself, on account of his purity, both the Republican and Federal parties) announced the principles of the republic; then it was that the principles were again sustained by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, down to Monroe. And I will show you, from the message of 1824, what were the views of Mr. Monroe upon precisely such a question as we now have—of interference with foreign nations. And I beg, Mr. President, simply to read what is said on this subject, in order that this may go out with that portion of Mr. Webster's speech which the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Monroe, in his annual message—

Mr. FOOTE. Will the Senator allow me to ask which he agrees with, Webster or Monroe?

Mr. DAWSON. I will say that if there is difference I should concur with Mr. Monroe; but I do not know that there is any difference between them. But I return the question to the gentleman, would he, in 1824, have concurred with Mr. Monroe?

Mr. FOOTE. If they are the same, there is no necessity for reading it.

Mr. DAWSON. I understand the gentleman to say they are the same. I will read from the message of 1824:

"In turning our attention to the condition of the civilized world, we are struck with the consideration that the influence of the United States is gratifying to see how large a portion of it is blessed with peace. The only wars which now exist within that limit are those between Turkey and Greece, in Europe; and between Mexico and the United States, in America. In the hemisphere of the New World, the cause of independence, of liberty, and humanity, continues to prevail. The success of Greece, and the progress of Mexico, are objects of our warmest sympathy, and our warmest commands our admiration and applause, and that it has had a similar effect with the neighboring Power."

ers is obvious. The feeling of the whole civilized world is excited in a high degree in their favor. May we not hope that these sentiments, winning on the more decisive result, that they may produce an accord among them to replace Greece on her ground which she formerly held, and to which her heroic exertions at this day so eminently entitle her?

It is not only our neighbors who are in a party. It is evident that Spain, as a Power, is scarcely felt in it. These new States had completely achieved their independence before it was acknowledged by the United States, and they have since that time been in the possession of their rights, which have appeared in certain portions of that vast territory have proceeded from internal causes, which had their origin in their former Governments, and have not yet been thoroughly removed. It is manifest that new States are settling down under Governments, elective and representative in every branch, similar to our own. In this course we evidently wish them to persevere, under a firm conviction that they will not be disturbed by the United States, and that we will have no interference, believing that every people had a right to institute for themselves the Government which, in their judg-

men, may suit them best. Our example is before them — of the good effect of which, being our neighbors, they are competent judges; and to their judgment we leave the same policy, the same course, the same measures to pursue the same policy. Our deep interest we take in their independence—which we have acknowledged, and in the enjoyment of all the rights incident thereto, especially in the very important one of instituting their own governments—has been declared, and is known to the world.

Here is the part to which I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Foote:)

“Separated as we are from Europe by the great Atlantic Ocean, we can have no concern in the wars of European Governments, nor in the causes which produce them. The balance of power between them, into whatever scale it may be thrown, is of no concern to us. We have no interest in the wars of the United States to preserve the most friendly relations with all. Power, and on conditions fair, equal, and applicable to all. But in regard to our neighbors our situation is different. It is impossible for the European Governments to interfere in our concerns, and we are not disposed to suffer them to do so without affording us; indeed, the motive which might induce such interference in the present state of the war between the parties, if a war it may be called, would appear to be

[illegible]

minute the tsaction favorable to parity and sectional purposes, is by no means uncommen. Why, sir, is this? Why, sir, it is wrong. There is a lot of candor and candor is a good thing, but it is not a distinguishing mark come here without telling him what we really intended to do is what I call unfair and unjust.

Why were we to open our arms and hearts to receive him? It was to throw around him the protection of the law, to give him the same rights as the poorest citizen, and give him a home in our country. But when he comes, he changes his character into that of an agitator, and proclaims to us—gentlemen, I come to dine with you, and will describe the character of the dishes that shall be put on the table. You want what I arranged for you, and I will give it to you. If you invite me to dine with you, I am to dictate as to the mode in which your table is to be spread. If you desire to keep from being de-

ceived, act with candor yourself. Now, Mr. President, this is a question that comes home to every man's honor—it comes home to the candor and magnanimity of every man. It is not to come home to us as mere politicians. The sentiments growing out of this question will very essentially affect our honor and our reputation as Senators. Is there a gentleman here who will say to Kossuth

We will give you the material of war at the proper time; and if Kossuth says to you, I came here with that expectation, he has no right to say so. He may wish to tell you, if you do not explain your course, as he said to the committee from Philadelphia, "If I had known before I came here that that was the limitation put upon your invitation, I would have hesitated long before I would have been invited." But it is not his business to say so. He has and manly independence that has ever marked his career. Let us follow the example; and, when we are dealing with a candid man and statesman in every sense of the term, let us not be afraid to state our own views.

Now, for this reason that I have taken my stand against this resolution. Hence it is that I would give him a cordial welcome as an exile to our shores. But the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass) says that he welcomes him as an invader of our territory. Now, what does he mean by that? What people? Kossuth himself says that it is the right of this nation to interfere with foreign nations. It is not the principle of non-intervention, but the right to interfere when two Powers are engaged in war to prevent a third Power from becoming involved. If we are unable to sustain, now, will you undertake to deceive him, or will you place the matter in its proper light, as my colleague (Mr. BERLIER) has endeavored to do by his amendment, thus setting the thing fairly before Kossuth? I think the latter course should be the one chosen. Truly,

I ask pardon of the Senate for having thus long occupied their time. It was not my design to speak long upon this subject. But I wished to inform this body of the course that, by being pursued, would, in my opinion, be doing justice to ourselves and to Kossuth.

Mr. MALLORY said: Mr. President, I design to vote on this resolution, and ask the indulgence of the Senate while I state the reasons which govern the vote that I shall give. As becomes a new member of this body, I have listened carefully to the remarks of honorable Senators opposed to the resolution, with a mind unbiased,

and anxious only to ascertain the course which wisdom and the dictates of a sound policy prescribe. This resolution is opposed by honorable Senators whose negative, apart from any argument, carries with it a moral influence which the country well understands, and which no Senator better appreciates than myself; and in differing from them on this occasion, as it is my misfortune to do, it is no less respectful to them than due to myself that I should express something more than a mere negative vote.

The objects of both resolutions, as I understand them—

case. The protest spoken of would, in my judgment, be a demonstration, and not a rally. I would not have been surprised, because I cannot in my mind grasp of the absurdity of assuming a position by protest which we had predetermined to maintain in the only manner which could possibly prove effectual among the nations of Europe. Our policy has been that of non-interference; and I am sure that the President would not have authorized the declaration of non-interference as the policy of the United States, unless it had been supported by the President, and, still, unless contradicted by an unheard-of exception. In this expediency, I would remind honorable Senators who maintain this idea of protest that but yesterday, as it was, we were engaged in a contest upon this continent: and that, in the midst of that contest with Mexico, we had heard, on one cold morning, that the Czar of Russia, from his distant throne, had sent his protest to the State Department

I say, therefore, that it is out of place to say that it is

from the inauspicious condition of European affairs, and from the fact that the President had been taken on shore. No man can successfully deny that. There was a reason why Congress should have been anxious that the President should transport Kossoff and associates here in a public ship, which would not occur—at least it never has heretofore in the case of any other person desiring to emigrate. We all know that the Emperor of Austria considered his entertainment in the White House an offence to him. We know that he demanded the expulsion of Turkey by the authority of the Sultan. We know that he desired to bring him within his jurisdiction and sovereignty in order to subject him to such punishment as he might deem suited to the occasion. It was therefore imperative that when the Sultan gave permission to the exile

He went further, as I may now state. I dislike to go to these particulars, but really the allusions of the honorable Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BADGER) make necessary for me to do so.

Mr. BADGER. Go on; I shall be glad to hear you.

Mr. POOTE, of Mississippi. He went further, and requested me to go to the efficient and talented Secretary of the body, as having that knowledge of parliamentary precedents and usages which so highly distinguishes him; and I went to his house without delay, at the instance of the Secretary of State, for the purpose of ascertaining how, in some mode consistent with Parliamentary andatorial usage, such a joint resolution could be intro-